

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1-4. These two (2) sheets, which include Figs. 1-4, replace the original sheets including Figs. 1-4. In Figs. 1-4, labels from the specification have been added.

Attachment: Two (2) Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

In reply to the final Office Action mailed February 9, 2010, please enter the amendments set forth above and consider the following remarks. By this response, Applicants amend claims 27, 31-32, and 34-37. No new matter has been added. Upon entry of this paper, claims 1-40 will remain pending in this application.

In the Office action, the Examiner reaffirmed the objection to the drawings. Applicants hereby submit 2 replacement sheets including labels, and request that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

In the Office action the Examiner rejected (i) claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,106,380 (Willis); (ii) claims 16 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,392,712 (Gryskiewicz); (iii) claims 5-6 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Willis in view of U.S. Patent 6,658,056 (Duruoz); (iv) claims 17-19 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gryskiewicz in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,423 (Oshima); (v) claims 28-30 and 33-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gryskiewicz in view of Willis; and (vi) claims 31-32 and 35-39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gryskiewicz in view of Willis in further view of Duruoz. Applicants respectfully traverse, submitting that the claims are allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed below.

I. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7,106,380 (Willis). Claim 1 recites "at times providing video frames of a performance at a slower input rate; at other times providing video frames of the performance at a faster input rate". On page 3 of the final Office action, the examiner states that this is shown by Willis column 2 lines 41-51, which discloses 480p and 720p input signal, and also discloses that 480p and 720p signals have different Fh in values, or different horizontal scan frequencies in the input signals (See Willis Col. 2 lines 45-51). Neither of these disclosures of Willis describe the above recitation of claim 1. 480p and 720p refers only to the resolution of each individual frame, and does not include any description of the input rate of the video frames.

Similarly, because a 720p signal is a higher resolution signal, a higher Fh in value is required to achieve the same video frame input rate as a 480p input signal.

Willis does describe doubling the frame rate after the input signal is received, (See Willis Col. 2 lines 56-57), but this is not a change in the input rate, but is instead a change in the output rate.

Therefore, for at least the reasons described above, Willis does not disclose all of the recitations of independent claim 1, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn. Additionally, since claims 2-4 and 7-8 depend from claim 1, they are allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

II. The Examiner rejected claims 16 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,392,712 (Gryskiewicz).

Claim 16 recites “at times providing video frames from a video program source at a slower input rate; displaying the frames received at the slower input rate; at other times providing video frames from the video program source at a higher input rate; combining the frames received at the higher input rate into combined frames at the slower frame rate; and displaying the combined frames at the slower frame rate”. On pages 3-4 and 7 of the final Office action, the Examiner states that this is disclosed by Gryskiewicz Fig. 1, Col. 1 lines 53-59, and Col. 3 lines 52-53.

Gryskiewicz describes combining interlaced video fields or frames with progressive frames. As part of this combination, two input signals are constantly sent, and there is not description of slower input rate at times and faster input rate at other times. Instead, the two input signals are constantly both sent, and are both synchronized together (See Gryskiewicz Col. 2 lines 29-31). The synchronization of the two signals is described as the entire motivation for the invention.

By contrast, claim 16 recites “combining the frames received at the higher input rate into combined frames at the slower frame rate”. Gryskiewicz describes that different signals are combined to create the new signal. In claim 16, higher rate and

lower rate signals are received, and the higher input rate frames are combined. This is different than Gryskiewicz where both signals are combined.

Additionally, claim 27 includes recitations similar to those of claim 16, and claims 20-26 depend from claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16 and 20-27 dependent thereon are allowable over the cited art, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

III. The Examiner rejected claims 5-6 and 9-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Willis in view of U.S. Patent 6,658,056 (Duruoz). As discussed above, Willis does not disclose all of the recitations of claim 1. Duruoz does not cure the deficiencies of Willis.

Duruoz discloses a decoder for decoding MPEG-2 video with a display control module to adjust output frame rate and field sequencing. Duruoz does not disclose “at times providing video frames of a performance at a slower input rate; at other times providing video frames of the performance at a faster input rate” as recited by independent claims 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and claims 5-6 and 9-15 dependent thereon are not obvious given the combination of Willis and Duruoz.

IV. The Examiner rejected claims 17-19 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gryskiewicz in view of U.S. Patent 6,574,423 (Oshima). As discussed above, Gryskiewicz does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 16. Oshima does not cure the deficiencies of Gryskiewicz.

Oshima describes an optical disc with a reproducing device that records first and second video signals on left and right sides by dividing the signals into frame groups. Oshima does not describe “combining the frames received at the higher input rate into combined frames at the slower frame rate; and displaying the combined frames at the slower frame rate”. Therefore Applicants respectfully submit that claim 16 and claims 17-19 dependent thereon are not obvious given Gryskiewicz and Oshima.

Claim 40 recites “a transmitter to transmit the selected frame rate to the video source to provide frames at an average rate depending on the selection”. On page 4 of the final Office action, the Examiner states that “because the control block is ultimately responsible for the synchronization and timing of signals to the receiver, it therefore must control the transmission of a frame rate”. This conclusion is not found in or supported by Gryskiewicz. Gryskiewicz does not include any transmission of a selected frame rate to a video source. Instead, the example provided by Gryskiewicz is of a synch pulse sent from the controller to the receiver. There is no teaching or suggestion of a selected frame rate being transmitted to a video source, and none is required to allow Gryskiewicz to function.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 is not obvious given Gryskiewicz and Oshima, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be withdrawn.

V. The Examiner rejected claims 28-39 given various combinations of Willis, Gryskiewicz, and Duruoz. As discussed above, these claims do not teach or suggest the limitations of the independent claims. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the claims are obvious given any combination of Willis, Gryskiewicz, and Duruoz.

Conclusions

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-40 are allowable over the cited art, and a notice of allowance is requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to call Applicants' attorney at the number below if doing so will in any way advance prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit in the overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **07-1896** referencing Attorney Docket No. **348162-982140**.

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER LLP (US)

Date: May 10, 2010

By: /Philip Jensen/
Philip Jensen
Reg. No. 63,563
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Philip Jensen
DLA Piper LLP (US)
2000 University Avenue
East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248
650-833-2119 (Direct)
650-833-2000 (Main)
650-833-2001 (Facsimile)
philip.jensen@dlapiper.com